

**United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Criminal Investigation Division  
Investigative Activity Report**

**Case Number:**

0303-M431

**Case Title:**

Manassas Battlefield Park

**Subject of Report:**

(b) (6), (b) Interview

**Reporting Office:**

Washington, DC, Resident Office

**Activity Date:**

March 15, 2017

**Reporting Official and Date:**

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Agent

17-MAR-2017, Signed by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

**Approving Official and Date:**

(b) (6), (b) (7)

Acting Special Agent in Charge

28-MAR-2017, Approved by: (b) (6), (b)

Acting Special Agent in Charge

**SYNOPSIS**

On March 15, 2017, Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) of the Environmental Protection Agency's Criminal Investigation Division (EPA-CID) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) of the U.S. Park Police (USPP) interviewed (b) (6), (b) at his office in Washington, DC. (b) (6), is the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for the National Park Service, National Capital Region. (b) provided information regarding an alleged illegal asbestos abatement project at the Manassas National Battlefield Park Visitor Center in Manassas, Virginia.

**DETAILS**

On March 15, 2017, SA (b) (6), EPA-CID, and (b) (b) (6), (b) USPP, interviewed (b) (b) at his office in Washington, DC. Agents identified themselves and explained the nature of the interview. (b) voluntarily agreed to speak with agents and provided the following information. This narrative is a summary of the interview and is not verbatim unless otherwise noted.

(b) is the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for the National Park Service, National Capital Region. On February 13 and 14, 2017, he was conducting a management review of the Manassas National Battlefield Park (the Park) in Manassas, Virginia. During the course of the review, employees of the park discussed an asbestos issue that took place in the visitor's center in July 2013.

(b) explained during that time there had been a flood in the visitor's center basement and the former (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), instructed employees to remove the carpet in the affected area. There were floor tiles underneath the carpet, which he also told employees to remove.

The floor tiles were reportedly asbestos containing and the six or seven employees that were told to do this work objected to it. (b) (6), reportedly knew the tiles contained asbestos and when challenged by the employees, he still instructed them to do the work.

The employees who engaged in the tile removal included maintenance workers, seasonal employees, and two youth conservation coordinators, who were 15 to 18 years old.

(b) explained that (b) (6), is a (b) (6), (b) (7) and has a volatile personality. He was employed with the National Park Service (NPS) for a long time, but bounced around to various parks about every two years. At one point he was stationed at the Harry Truman historic site in Missouri. (b) explained there was a worker's compensation claim filed, which included claims against (b) (6), for lead abatement and other safety violations.

(b) (6), retired on medical disability in 2013. (b) explained he was actually forced into retirement because he was accused of selling scrap metal which he obtained from NPS property.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.  
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;  
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Criminal Investigation Division  
Investigative Activity Report**

**Case Number:**

0303-M431

(b) explained the asbestos floor tiles were removed by employees who were not trained or certified, had no personal protective equipment and with no proper notifications. The work area was reportedly thick with dust and no wetting agents were used. Employees used a regular vacuum to clean the area and disposed of the asbestos tiles in a regular dumpster at the Park.

(b) added that the tiles were breaking during removal and the work area was about 25 X 15 feet, and also included a hallway.

The (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) at the time was (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). (b) reportedly contacted the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conducted sampling of the work area about four days after the work. He took dust wipe samples and bulk samples of the tiles which indicated the presence of chrysotile asbestos over one percent.

The current (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is (b) (6), (b) (7) and the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

(b) provided agents with copies of NPS emails regarding the incident, public online information about (b) (6), the EMSL Analytical lab analysis reports, his interview notes and the order from the US Employees' Compensation Appeals Board (see attachments).

(b) had nothing further to provide. Agents thanked (b) for his assistance and concluded the interview.

**ATTACHMENT**

(b) Documents